

From: Steven Craddock <scraddock@blm.gov>  
Sent: Wednesday, April 08, 2015 5:13 PM  
To: Closson, Dee A -FS  
Subject: RE: Sunshine Campground EA decision stuff

Excellent. Thank you.

Also, regarding the need for expedited review in Washington, I've put that the Dept. of Agriculture expects the FS to complete the exchange this fiscal year, and the non-Federal parties expect to close in early summer. Since I'm editing this anyway, I'll be happy to bolster that statement if you want to provide me with more information.

Respectfully,

Steve Craddock  
Land Tenure Program Lead  
Colorado State Office - BLM  
PH: 303-239-3707

From: Closson, Dee A -FS [mailto:daclosson@fs.fed.us]  
Sent: Wednesday, April 08, 2015 4:51 PM  
To: Steven Craddock  
Subject: RE: Sunshine Campground EA decision stuff

Thanks Steve. I already have this on my list to send to you when we release it to the public. I will make sure the language is included in the Decision Notice.  
Thanks!  
Dee

From: Steven Craddock [mailto:scraddock@blm.gov]  
Sent: Wednesday, April 08, 2015 4:50 PM  
To: Closson, Dee A -FS  
Subject: Sunshine Campground EA decision stuff

Hey Dee, I should have asked for this during our phone call, but ... would you please send me the draft Decision Record and FONSI when it is posted. Also, just in case the Decision Record references the partial revocation, would you please make sure the Decision Record addresses that as a recommendation to the Secretary of the Interior, and NOT as a decision proper. The reason for this is two-fold: 1) the decision is the Secretary's by law, and 2) by listing it as a recommendation, there is not an

administrative appeal right.

Let me know if you have questions. Thanks!

Respectfully,

Steve Craddock  
Land Tenure Program Lead  
Colorado State Office - BLM  
PH: 303-239-3707

From: Closson, Dee A -FS [mailto:daclosson@fs.fed.us]  
Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2015 4:19 PM  
To: Steven Craddock  
Cc: Closson, Dee A -FS  
Subject: RE: Letter from BLM (Andy Senti) Section 24 Reservation

There is only one parcel that is subject to the Section 24 reservation and here is the legal description:

New Mexico P.M., T. 42 N., R. 9 W.,  
Sec. 22: lot 19,  
          Lot 17, portion  
          Tract 53, portion

Thanks for checking. The paragraph you sent was much different than the canned verbage we normally use which is this:

1. The right to itself, its permittees, or licensees to enter upon, occupy, and use any part or all of the said land included in FERC Project 400 which is necessary, in the judgment of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, for the purposes of Part 1 of the Federal Power Act of August 26, 1935, as amended (16 U.S.C. 818); and no claim or right to compensation shall accrue from the occupation or use of any of the said land for such purposes. The United States or any licensee for any such land may enter thereupon for the purposes of Part 1 of the Federal Power Act upon payment of any damages to crops, buildings, or other improvements caused thereby to the owner thereof, or upon giving good and sufficient bond to the United States for the use and benefit of the owner to secure the payment of such damages as may be determined and fixed in an action brought upon the bond by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. Any structure or improvements placed upon the land must be removed or

relocated at no expense or liability to the United States, its permittees, or licensees should the Commission determine that such action is necessary to avoid interference with power development; and under the following additional restrictions contained in the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's determination ( \* ), dated ( \* ): (Additional stipulations may occur upon official notification from FERC). (Affects Federal Parcel 3D (CO-15944)).

\* Determination number and date will be obtained when official notification is received from FERC.

So I guess I will continue to use the canned verbage we have used in the past (directly above) and state that there are no additional restrictions since we wont be receiving a letter from FERC.

Please confirm.  
Thanks!  
Dee

From: Steven Craddock [mailto:scraddock@blm.gov]  
Sent: Friday, March 13, 2015 10:52 AM  
To: Closson, Dee A -FS  
Subject: RE: Letter from BLM (Andy Senti) Section 24 Reservation

Dee,

There is a very well-established practice for reserving FERC powerlines when patenting Federal land. The reservation language is:

"The to itself, its permittees or licensees, to enter upon, occupy and use any part or all of (describe land affected) lying within \_\_\_\_ feet of the center line of the transmission line right-of-way of the (name of company) (Project No.), for the purposes set forth in and subject to the conditions and limitations of Section 24 of the Federal Power Act of June 10, 1920, as amended (16 U.S.C. 818).

A letter from FERC is not required for qualified lines. Andy believes this is a qualified powerline and so all we need to do is fill in the (blanks) above.

I would like to double-check tho, so would you please provide to me the legal description for each section within the exchange proposal that the powerline crosses?

Thank you!

Respectfully,

Steve Craddock  
Land Tenure Program Lead  
Colorado State Office - BLM  
PH: 303-239-3707

From: Closson, Dee A -FS [mailto:daclosson@fs.fed.us]  
Sent: Tuesday, March 10, 2015 5:17 PM  
To: Steven Craddock (scraddock@blm.gov)  
Subject: FW: Letter from BLM (Andy Senti) Section 24 Reservation

Hi Steve  
I sent the email below on March 3 and haven't heard back from you. Can you answer my email below from March 3?  
Thanks  
Dee

From: Closson, Dee A -FS  
Sent: Tuesday, March 03, 2015 3:34 PM  
To: Steven Craddock (scraddock@blm.gov)  
Subject: Letter from BLM (Andy Senti) Section 24 Reservation

Hi Steve  
I've enclosed a letter that I received from the BLM. Its in regards to the withdrawal revocation requests. One of our federal parcels is within CO-15944, which is a FERC withdrawal for an overhead powerline. In the enclosed letter, we have permission to convey this federal parcel subject to Section 24 of the Federal Power Act. In the past, we usually get an official notification letter from FERC identifying any stipulations within that withdrawal area. When you and I visited last, Andy Senti said he would be writing that letter with the stipulations and that we wouldn't get anything from FERC. Has Andy had a chance to write that letter?  
Thanks  
Dee

Dee A. Closson  
Lands/Minerals Staff Officer  
Forest Service  
Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre and  
Gunnison National Forest,  
Norwood Ranger District

p: 970-327-4261  
f: 970-327-4854  
daclosson@fs.fed.us  
PO Box 388  
Norwood, CO 81423  
www.fs.fed.us

Caring for the land and serving people

This electronic message contains information generated by the USDA solely for the intended recipients. Any unauthorized interception of this message or the use or disclosure of the information it contains may violate the law and subject the violator to civil or criminal penalties. If you believe you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and delete the email immediately.